

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,993	CARGILL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

All Participants:

Status of Application: election

(1) Juliet C. Switzer.

(3) _____

(2) Ben Wang.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 26 October 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 4, 6, 36

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and Mr. Wang discussed possible amendments to place the application in condition for allowance. However, subsequent to the conversation, the examiner updated the search and discovered post-filing date references that provided evidence of lack of enablement. Due to these references, the offer of allowable subject matter was withdrawn in favor of a first action on the merits to explore the question of enablement of the claimed invention. .